

Exhibit D

Refugee Social Services (RSS25-0001)				
Proposal Number:6				
Bidding Organization: Bethany Christian Services (Kent)				
Experience & Past Performance			15points available	
	Question	Available Points	Points Awarded	Comments / Reason for Deduction
Bidder's Experience: Past Projects	2.1-a	Does the bidder have a history of working with populations that align with the service specifications in this RFP?	3	3.00
	2.1-b	For each agreement/funding source, did the bidder provide a service name, a description of the service, the timeframe during which the service was funded and/or provided, with whom the agreement and/or funding was with, and the name of the contact person?	2	2.00
Bidder's Experience: Populations Served	2.2	Did the bidder provide principle characteristics, including the population (i.e. Cuban/Haitian Entrant, Refugee, Asylee, etc.) and primary language(s) spoken?	5	4.00
Bidder's Experience: Collaborations	2.3	To what degree has the bidder demonstrated the ability to collaborate with, or otherwise utilize local resources within their community?	5	5.00
Total Points Awarded for Experience & Past Performance			14.00	
Program Design			65points available	
	Question	Available Points	Points Awarded	Comments / Reason for Deduction
Identified Need	3.1-a	How well has the bidder demonstrated an understanding of the service area and the needs of the targeted populations?	8	5.00
	3.1-b	Did the bidder describe the economic, social, cultural, linguistic, or any other barriers which prevent community members from accessing refugee social services?	5	2.50
	3.1-c	Did the bidder provide citations to backup claims?	2	2.00
	3.1-d	Did the bidder describe additional funding sources available to serve eligible populations and how funding will complement and not duplicate existing services?	5	2.50
Program Design	3.2-a	How well did the bidder describe of the proposed program(s)?	15	14.00
	3.2-b	Did the bidder propose 1) target population, 2) supported activities (Section II, 4), and 3) outcomes and metrics of the supported activities planned to track during the life of the program(s)?	10	8.00
	3.2-c	Did the bidder describe how the program(s) will be designed to address the unique needs of the target population identified in 3.1?	10	8.00
Program Implementation	3.3-a	How well has the bidder describe the program(s) implementation?	3	1.00
	3.3-b	Did the bidder describe a hiring plan of culturally proficient and competent staff that represent the cultural, national origin, and religions of the newcomer populations being served?	3	0.00
	3.3-c	Did the bidder describe training opportunities for staff?	1	0.50
	3.3-d	Did the bidder provide a timeline for availability of supported activities? Has the bidder identified a number of additional individuals needed to successfully fulfill the goal and activities listed in this RFP? Were the roles explained and were job descriptions included?	2	1.50
	3.3-e	Did the bidder describe plans to address activities needed in the community but not allowable under this funding?	1	0.00
Total Points Awarded for Program Design			45.00	
General Program Design			0points available	
	Question	Available Points	Points Awarded	Comments / Reason for Deduction
County/Countries:	3.3	What county/counties were proposed for the program service(s)?	0	Kent
Program(s):	3.3	What program(s) were proposed? (RES and/or	0	RES, RPRS
Funding:	3.3	What funding type(s) were proposed? (RSS and/or ASA)	0	RSS & ASA
Total Points Awarded for General			0.00	
Program Budget Proposal			20points available	
	Question	Available Points	Points Awarded	Comments / Reason for Deduction
Budget	4.1	Did the bidder propose a realistic budget within the estimated award amount for the program(s)?	10	7.00
Narrative	4.2	Did the bidder provide a thorough description for each of the categories listed in Chart 4.1., per program for the first fiscal year?	10	10.00
Total Points Awarded for Program Budget Proposal			17.00	
Total Points Awarded			76.00	

Refugee Social Services (RSS25-0001)				
Proposal Number: 3				
Bidding Organization: Bethany Christian Services (Kalamazoo)				
Experience & Past Performance		15 points available		
	Question	Available Points	Points Awarded	Comments / Reason for Deduction
Bidder's Experience: Past Projects	2.1-a Does the bidder have a history of working with populations that align with the service specifications in this RFP?	3	3.00	
	2.1-b For each agreement/funding source, did the bidder provide a service name, a description of the service, the timeframe during which the service was funded and/or provided, with whom the agreement and/or funding was with, and the name of the contact person?	2	2.00	
Bidder's Experience: Populations Served	2.2 Did the bidder provide principle characteristics, including the population (i.e. Cuban/Haitian Entrant, Refugee, Asylee, etc.) and primary language(s) spoken?	5	5.00	
Bidder's Experience: Collaborations	2.3 To what degree has the bidder demonstrated the ability to collaborate with, or otherwise utilize local resources within their community?	5	4.00	Several collaboratives were outside proposed county with underwhelming description of lack of collaborative opportunities in Kalamazoo county.
Total Points Awarded for Experience & Past Performance			14.00	
Program Design		65 points available		
	Question	Available Points	Points Awarded	Comments / Reason for Deduction
Identified Need	3.1-a How well has the bidder demonstrated an understanding of the service area and the needs of the targeted populations?	8	8.00	
	3.1-b Did the bidder describe the economic, social, cultural, linguistic, or any other barriers which prevent community members from accessing refugee social services?	5	5.00	
	3.1-c Did the bidder provide citations to backup claims?	2	2.00	
	3.1-d Did the bidder describe additional funding sources available to serve eligible populations and how funding will complement and not duplicate existing services?	5	5.00	
Program Design	3.2-a How well did the bidder describe of the proposed program(s)?	15	15.00	
	3.2-b Did the bidder propose 1) target population, 2) supported activities (Section II, 4), and 3) outcomes and metrics of the supported activities planned to track during the life of the program(s)?	10	10.00	
	3.2-c Did the bidder describe how the program(s) will be designed to address the unique needs of the target population identified in 3.1?	10	10.00	
Program Implementation	3.3-a How well has the bidder describe the program(s) implementation?	3	1.00	Bidder did not adequately address a compliance plan for the non-discrimination and DEI contract components.
	3.3-b Did the bidder describe a hiring plan of culturally proficient and competent staff that represent the cultural, national origin, and religions of the newcomer populations being served?	3	0.00	Bidder did not describe an acceptable plan.
	3.3-c Did the bidder describe training opportunities for staff?	1	0.50	Bidder did not describe the types of required trainings or offered to staff.
	3.3-d Did the bidder provide a timeline for availability of supported activities? Has the bidder identified a number of additional individuals needed to successfully fulfill the goal and activities listed in this RFP? Were the roles explained and were job descriptions included?	2	1.50	Dec. 2024. - Unclear why bidder would not start Oct. 1.
	3.3-e Did the bidder describe plans to address activities needed in the community but not allowable under this funding?	1	1.00	
Total Points Awarded for Program Design			59.00	
General Program Design		0 points available		
	Question	Available Points	Points Awarded	Comments / Reason for Deduction
County/Countries:	3.3 What county/countries were proposed for the program service(s)?	0		Kalamazoo
Program(s):	3.3 What program(s) were proposed? (RES and/or	0		RES
Funding:	3.3 What funding type(s) were proposed? (RSS and/or ASA)	0		RSS & ASA
Total Points Awarded for General			0.00	
Program Budget Proposal		20 points available		
	Question	Available Points	Points Awarded	Comments / Reason for Deduction
Budget	4.1 Did the bidder propose a realistic budget within the estimated award amount for the program(s)?	10	10.00	Budget is high for proposed number of clients.
Narrative	4.2 Did the bidder provide a thorough description for each of the categories listed in Chart 4.1., per program for the first fiscal year?	10	10.00	
Total Points Awarded for Program Budget Proposal			20.00	
Total Points Awarded			93.00	

Remote Refugee Social Services (RSS25-0002)				
Proposal Number: 1				
Bidding Organization: Bethany Christian Services of Michigan				
Experience & Past Performance		15 points available		
Bidder's Experience: Past Projects	Question	Available Points	Points Awarded	Comments / Reason for Deduction
2.1-a	Does the bidder have a history of working with populations that align with the service specifications in this RFP?	3	3.00	
	2.1-b For each agreement/funding source, did the bidder provide a service name, a description of the service, the timeframe during which the service was funded and/or provided, with whom the agreement and/or funding was with, and the name of the contact person?	2	2.00	
Bidder's Experience: Populations Served	2.2 Did the bidder provide principle characteristics, including the population (i.e. Cuban/Haitian Entrant, Refugee, Asylee, etc.) and primary language(s) spoken?	5	5.00	
Bidder's Experience: Collaborations	2.3 To what degree has the bidder demonstrated the ability to collaborate with, or otherwise utilize local resources within their community?	5	4.00	Bidder mentions working with employers but had underwhelming employer collaborations.
Total Points Awarded for Experience & Past Performance			14.00	
Program Design		65 points available		
Identified Need	Question	Available Points	Points Awarded	Comments / Reason for Deduction
3.1-a	How well has the bidder demonstrated an understanding of the rural service areas and the needs of the targeted populations?	8	3.00	Underwhelming context on the local region, but bidder did not elaborate on specific needs of refugee/ORR populations. Bidder did not mention the need for technology or internet.
	3.1-b Did the bidder describe the economic, social, cultural, linguistic, or any other barriers which prevent community members from accessing mainstream refugee social services?	5	2.00	Bidder did not describe economic, cultural or linguistic barriers. Bidder only focused on barriers of living in a rural community.
	3.1-c Did the bidder provide citations to backup claims?	2	2.00	
	3.1-d Did the bidder describe additional funding sources available to serve eligible populations and how funding will complement and not duplicate existing services?	5	4.00	Underwhelming description of additional funding sources available to serve populations in rural areas.
Program Design	3.2-a How well did the bidder describe of the proposed program(s)?	10	8.00	Plan for intakes w/in 14 days of arrival does is not realistic for the arrival pathways or region served. Social adjustment services designed specifically toward one population.
	3.2-b Did the bidder propose 1) target regions and population, 2) supported activities (Section II, 4), and 3) outcomes and metrics of the supported activities planned to track during the life of the program(s)?	10	8.00	Target population includes clients from Ukraine and Afghanistan but does not consider other ORR populations. Bidder does not mention other ORR eligible populations needing remote services apart from individuals they resettle.
	3.2-c Did the bidder describe methods to establish partnerships with existing social service agencies, school districts, health departments, and other relevant partners or impacted community organizations in identified areas to be served? If not, has the bidder identified alternative and realistic methods to connect the target population to services?	10	7.00	Bidder describes intention to develop new and existing partnerships but does not describe the methods for doing so.
	3.2-d Did the bidder describe how the program(s) will be designed to address the unique needs of the target population identified in 3.1?	5	2.50	Underwhelming methods to address needs of providing services in a rural area. Spoke into needs of Ukrainian population and mentioned Afghans.
Program Implementation	3.3-a How well has the bidder describe the program(s) implementation?	3	1.00	Bidder does not adhere to Non-Discrimination & Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Practices requirements. Underwhelming training opportunities and outreach.
	3.3-b Did the bidder describe a hiring plan of culturally proficient and competent staff that represent the cultural, national origin, and religions of the newcomer populations being served??	2	0.00	Bidder did not describe an acceptable plan.
	3.3-c Did the bidder describe staff roles and training opportunities?	1	0.50	Underwhelming description of training opportunities. Unclear description of how staff are allocated to program.
	3.3-d Has the bidder identified plans for outreach in rural communities to clients and service providers?	2	1.00	Outreach focused on Ukrainian community - emphasis on engaging 'leaders' and faith based partners
	3.3-e Did the bidder provide a timeline for availability of supported activities?	1	1.00	
	3.3-f Did the bidder describe plans to address activities needed in the community but not allowable under this funding?	1	1.00	
Total Points Awarded for Program Design			41.00	
General Program Design		0 points available		
County/Countries	Question	Available Points	Points Awarded	Comments / Reason for Deduction
3.3	What county/countries were proposed for the program service(s)?	0		Alcona, Alpena, Antrim, Benzie, Charlevoix, Cheboygan, Crawford, Emmet, Grand Traverse, Iosco, Kalkaska, Leelanau, Manistee, Missaukee, Montmorency, Ogemaw, Oscoda, Otsego, Presque Isle, Roscommon, and Wexford.
Program(s)	3.3 What programs were proposed? (RES and/or providers?)	0		RES & RPRS
Total Points Awarded for General			0.00	
Program Budget Proposal		20 points available		
Budget	Question	Available Points	Points Awarded	Comments / Reason for Deduction
4.1	Did the bidder propose a realistic budget within the estimated award amount for the program(s)?	10	9.50	Bidder did not calculate total amount.
Narrative	4.2 Did the bidder provide a thorough description for each of the categories listed in Chart 4.1., per program for the first fiscal year?	10	10.00	
Total Points Awarded for Program Budget Proposal			19.50	
Total Points Awarded			74.50	